

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
EASTERN DIVISION  
Case No. 4:20-cv-00152-M

KAREN BAILEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW SAUL, Commissioner of  
Social Security,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

On August 12, 2020, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a memorandum and recommendation (the “M&R”). [DE-5] In the M&R, Judge Numbers recommended that the court deny Plaintiff Karen Bailey’s motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. [DE-1, 4] The deadline for Plaintiff to object to the M&R has passed, and Plaintiff has not filed any objections.

The Fourth Circuit has said:

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.

*Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks, brackets, emphases, and citations omitted); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

The court has reviewed the M&R and the record and is satisfied that there is no clear error reflected on the face thereof. Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the M&R and DENIES Plaintiff's motion, and DIRECTS Plaintiff to tender the \$400 filing and administrative fee to the clerk.

SO ORDERED this the 2<sup>d</sup> day of Sept., 2020.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD E. MYERS II  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE